

DEC 2 1930

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
 Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50.  
 Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.  
 Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXIV, No. 7

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1930

WHOLE No. 644

*Make your sequence an Ullman and Henry one*

with

## THIRD LATIN BOOK

By ULLMAN, HENRY and WHITE

It carries on the excellence which is making

ELEMENTARY LATIN

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN

SECOND LATIN BOOK

SECOND LATIN BOOK (REVISED)

triumphant in the field of Secondary School Latin

*The new member of the*

**MACMILLAN  
CLASSICAL  
SERIES**

B. L. ULLMAN  
General Editor

**T**HIRD Latin Book diverges from the usual Ciceronian diet given Latin students in the third year. Here is a wealth of material from classical literature suited in subject and difficulty to students of this level. It has been selected to develop maximum facility in reading the language, together with maximum appreciation of Roman life and culture.

### Contents

|                                 |                                       |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| CAESAR'S CIVIL WAR (SELECTIONS) | SENECA (SELECTIONS)                   |
| PLINY AND GELLIUS (SELECTIONS)  | MACROBIUS AND QUINTILIAN (SELECTIONS) |
| PETRONIUS (SELECTIONS)          | CICERO AND SALLUST (SELECTIONS)       |
| OVID'S METAMORPHOSES            |                                       |

Ingeniously combined with the reading material are vocabulary drills, syntax, and word-studies, making unnecessary the use of a separate Grammar.

Beautifully illustrated in color, and in black and white half-tones. \$2.20

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

New York Boston Chicago Dallas Atlanta San Francisco

## THE HISTORICAL-CULTURAL BACKGROUND

which has been emphasized so strongly in the *Recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation* has been carefully incorporated in various important features of Professor Place's two Latin books. The student acquires this valuable, sympathetic understanding of ancient life and history through the Introduction and the Notes, the human-interest stories presenting classic tales, the accounts in English, etc., etc.

The new Place Latin books are in harmony with the *Requirements of the College Entrance Board*. According to their improved method of teaching, the more difficult grammatical forms and principles and syntax are postponed until the beginning of the second year. The student does not begin the reading of Caesar so early but this sounder foundation enables him to progress more rapidly and surely.

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Place's First Year Latin . . . . .  | \$1.32 |
| Intermediate Latin Lessons . . . . .  | .40    |
| First Year Latin. Enlarged. Including<br>Intermediate Latin Lessons . . . . . | 1.40   |
| Place's Second Latin Course . . . . .   | 1.68   |

---

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIV, No. 7

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1930

WHOLE No. 644

## AMBROSE AND CICERO

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan at the end of the fourth century, was an energetic and important figure in the development of Western Christianity. Milan was virtually the capital of the West, for a great part of the time the residence of the Emperor and the center of his civil and military organization, and the scene, moreover, of important episodes in the final struggle between orthodox and Arian Christianity. It was fortunate that in 374 both parties agreed on Ambrose as the successor to Auxentius in the episcopal seat. A lawyer and administrator in early life, Ambrose turned reluctantly to the duties of an ecclesiastic, but by hard work and long study he gained so farsighted and steadfast a view of the place of the Church in the world that the principles which he enunciated of the relations between Church and State have always since his time been the official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Theodosius was made to bow to the moral code of Christianity even in matters where the Church had no direct interest. Justina, the mother of Valentinian II, was made to see clearly that the State could not uphold a heresy, that "in questions concerning the faith, it is the Bishops who are the judges of Christian Emperors, and not the Emperors who are the judges of the Bishops"<sup>1</sup>.

Although much of his time was occupied with affairs of State, with Church administration, with purely parochial matters, Ambrose was forced to add his share to the elucidation and the statement of Christian doctrine for the Latin world. Much had already been done in the East and the central doctrines of the Church had been formulated by the Council of Nicaea, in 325. But little of the exegesis of Scripture and of the statement of the implications of Christianity was yet available in the West. Ambrose undertook to instruct his flock in these matters, and his writings, filling four volumes (14-17) of the *Patrologia Latina*, were the result. Apart from the letters and the hymns, these works fall into three classes—first, dogmatic and controversial, expounding the first sections of the Nicene Creed, second, exegetical, interpreting various books or passages of the Bible in the literal, allegorical, and moral way already elaborated by the Greek Fathers and destined to hold the Middle Ages under its sway, third, ethical. It is with this third class, or rather with its most important member, the treatise *De Officiis Ministrorum*, that we are concerned, for in this work we find very clearly the influence of Cicero's *De Officiis*.

<sup>1</sup>Epistulae 21.4. The text of Ambrose is quoted from *Patrologia Latina*, Volumes 14-17, published by J. P. Migne, in 1845.

Translations of passages from Ambrose are taken from St. Ambrose, *Select Works and Letters*, Translated by Rev. H. De Romestin, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second Series, Volume X (Oxford, James Parker and Company, 1896). Translations of Biblical passages are from the King James Version. The Latin of Biblical passages is taken from the Vulgate.

If we wonder how a man so engrossed with the practical details of his work and so enmeshed in the religious and the political controversies of his time could find opportunity to write all the voluminous treatises that bear his name, we must look for the solution to his ability as a preacher. It was to his pastoral eloquence that Ambrose owed his greatest influence over souls. Saint Augustine, even before his conversion a constant hearer of Ambrose, gives us his direct testimony on this point<sup>2</sup>:

Studiose audiebam <eum = Ambrosium> disputantem in populo, et verbis eius suspendebam intentus, rerum autem incuriosus et contemptor adstabam: et delectabar sermonis suavitatem.

Thus Ambrose's constant practice of writing out or dictating his sermons and of recasting them somewhat hastily in literary form created his books. For example, the *Hexaëmeron*, a work which expounds the literal and the moral meaning of the six days of creation in accordance with the exegetical method indicated in the preceding paragraph, consists of nine addresses to the people of Milan, delivered in the last week of Lent, in 389. Later, the work was divided into six books. Here and there traces of its origin appear, left by a careless reviser or by a reviser who was untroubled by incongruities of expression. Such traces are the finishing words or the resumption of a sermon, or an allusion to the declining day or to the fatigue of his hearers.

When we come to Ambrose's *De Officiis Ministrorum*, we again find such traces of the sermon style. At the very beginning<sup>3</sup> occur the words: *Audisti hodie lectum*. A few sentences later<sup>4</sup> we find much the same expression: *sicut audisti hodie legi*. A few other passages involve the verb *lego*, but the implication there need not be anything more than that he who wishes may read what is then quoted. The two passages referred to above occur in the Introduction to Book I and in an exhortation to speak at the proper moment and to keep silence at the proper moment, followed by the statement that Ambrose now feels it necessary to write on duties (*officia*). Probably this introductory section had been a sermon before it became a preface and was worked over, if at all, somewhat negligently. That Ambrose did not mean the whole treatise to create the illusion of a spoken discourse is quite clear from the general make-up and style of the work, as well as from such expressions as *ad vos filios meos scribens*<sup>5</sup>. Some authorities, notably the Benedictine editors to whom we owe the *Patrologia*, writing of Ambrose's *De Officiis*, have expressed the thought that it was made up by casting together a number of sermons and adding enough connecting material to form one whole. But, as I have pointed out, it is only in the Introduction that

<sup>2</sup>Confessiones 5.13.    <sup>3</sup>1.13.    <sup>4</sup>1.15.    <sup>5</sup>1.23.



traces of the phraseology of sermons appear. There, rather than later in the work, we should have expected the author to use care in eliminating these tags, and the inference is that whatever was taken from sermons in the main body of the treatise was taken only indirectly, from memory rather than from written copies of sermons. Moreover, the verbal correspondence of Ambrose's work with Cicero's is in many passages very close. The hypothesis of the Benedictines would, therefore, involve the assumption (as Ebert has pointed out<sup>4</sup>) that Ambrose used Cicero as his text in sermons, an incredible thing if we consider the Bishop's general attitude toward the pagan philosophers. This will be treated below in its proper place. It may be assumed, then, that the sources of the *De Officiis Ministrorum* do not, except for the Introduction, include written sermons. Illustrations and the general exegetic method may be due to the practices employed in sermons, but it is not necessary to believe that there were direct borrowings from works already written down.

Before we go on to consider the *De Officiis Ministrorum* in detail, we must say something about the style of Ambrose's writings. They make dull reading. Whatever interest they have is as receptacles of ideas and not as literary productions. This follows inevitably from the author's personality and purpose. He was preeminently a practical man; in his sermons and in his writings he had a practical end in view. The ethical works contain little that is ethical in the sense in which the Nicomachean Ethics, Cicero's *De Finibus*, and Kant's *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals* are ethical. They are, rather, collections of formulae which will aid the faithful in regulating their daily lives; the formulae are even in great part casuistical. All Ambrose's works have as their aim to teach matters of faith and morals which are consonant with the teachings and the purpose of the Church as laid down in the Creeds and in the Scriptures. He is, in Augustine's language, 'a faithful teacher of the Church, and even at the risk of his life a most strenuous defender of Catholic truth'.

Ambrose's attitude toward learning forms another side of this very practical aim. In a passage in the *De Officiis*<sup>5</sup> he very specifically dissents from Cicero's view<sup>6</sup> that the search for truth is man's duty when the search can be followed without prejudice to a life of activity. Ambrose will have none of the Greek enthusiasm for the study of geometry and astronomy. The Christian's desire for truth is directed solely toward the Author of his being; *generis sui auctorem investigandum putat*<sup>7</sup>. In the *Hexaëmeron*<sup>8</sup> Ambrose says, even more explicitly, "To discuss the nature and the position of the earth does not help us in our hope of life to come. It is enough to know what Scripture <Job 26.7> says, 'that He hangeth the earth upon nothing' ". Physical phenomena have for our author no laws except the will of God. Here we have that

gazing beyond the works of God to another world that is such a marked characteristic of medieval thought. Such a spirit puts the miracle on the same level with any phenomenon that demonstrates the working of causality. God's will is sufficient cause to bring about any physical effect. It is this spirit that accepts the natural history of the Alexandrine work entitled *Physiologus* as sufficient for all needs of knowledge and sees in philosophy merely the handmaiden of theology<sup>10a</sup>.

Returning then to the question of literary style, we can see clearly that beauties of style, ornate rhetoric, figures of language have little place in Christian writings. They must not be cultivated for themselves, for they have no relation to the life hereafter, and there is no other cogent reason why they should be cultivated. Jerome felt that his stylistic studies were rebuked by Heaven when he heard in a dream the words, "Ciceronianus es!" This illustrates the searchings of conscience which afflicted the men of the patristic period, and which as much as any other reason led toward that formlessness and often unattractiveness which are so striking a part of most medieval productions. Our author's writings are well on the way to the complete barbarization of later times. It must be said on the other side that the sincerity and deep faith and sobriety which can make medieval Latin readable are abundantly found in Ambrose. That inward form which was imposed upon language by the moral and spiritual enthusiasm of Christianity could be a worthy substitute for the outward form which the search for beauty gave to classical literature. Ambrose says in two passages of the *De Officiis*<sup>11</sup> that readers should seek in his writings *non sermonum suppellectilem neque artem dicendi*, but merely *simplicem rerum gratiam*, 'the simple charm of the subject itself'. In one of his letters<sup>12</sup>, he states the opposition even more clearly: *Negant plerique nostros secundum artem scripsisse, nec nos obnitimur, non enim secundum artem scriperunt, sed secundum gratiam, quae super omnem artem est, scriperunt enim quae spiritus iis loqui dabat.*

His use of *spiritus* here may be contrasted with Horace's use of the word, e. g. *Carmina* 2.16. 37-39:

mihi parva rura et  
spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae  
Parca non mendax dedit. . . .

With Horace the word means the inspiration to self-expression, with Ambrose it means the Holy Spirit that seeks what is at best a poor expression through the words of mere men.

Ambrose's treatise *De Officiis Ministrorum* (or *Clericorum*) is, as its title indicates, a work on morality addressed to those Christians who formed the clergy. Ambrose states his purpose and his sources in 1.24: Although some philosophers have written on this subject—Panaetius, for instance, and his son amongst the Greek, Cicero amongst the Latin, writers—I did

<sup>4</sup>Adolf Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, 1.162 (Leipzig, P. C. W. Vogel, 1889).

<sup>5</sup>1.122-123. <sup>6</sup>*De Officiis* 1.18-19.

<sup>7</sup>Ambrose, *De Officiis Ministrorum* 1.124.

<sup>8</sup>1.32. The translation is that of H. O. Taylor, *The Medieval Mind*, 1.73. I have altered the quotation from Job to the form in which it appears in the King James Version.

<sup>10a</sup>Several examples of the use made of this work in medieval sermons are given by Charles H. Beeson, *A Primer of Medieval Latin*. <Professor Beeson (page 46, note 1) describes the *Physiologus* as a work "in which the peculiarities of animals and fabulous creatures were given a mystical, symbolical interpretation. . . it was a popular source book for medieval writers and is also important in the history of art". C. K.>

<sup>11</sup>1.39; 3.138. <sup>12</sup>8.1.

not think it foreign to my office to write myself also. And as Cicero wrote for the instruction of his son, so I too write to teach you, my children. For I love you whom I have begotten in the Gospel no less than if you were my own true sons. For nature does not make us love more ardently than grace. We certainly ought to have greater love for those who we think will be with us for ever than for those who will be with us in this world only. These often are born unworthy of their race, so as to bring disgrace on their father; but you we chose beforehand to love. They are loved of necessity, which is not a sufficiently suitable and constant teacher to implant a lasting love. But you are loved on the ground of our deliberate choice, whereby a feeling of affection is combined with the strength of our love; thus one tests what one loves and loves what one has chosen.

It needs no demonstration that Ambrose's chief source apart from Holy Scripture was Cicero's treatise *De Officiis*. The parallelism throughout is close. As Cicero's purpose was to provide a moral handbook for his son's use in politics, so Ambrose's purpose was to provide a collection of formulae for the use of the clergy. But in both cases this purpose was somewhat neglected, or, rather, widened in its scope. Cicero gives rules which have a general human application, even in some cases rules which are meant for persons other than politicians and have no bearing upon political life. Ambrose gives rules also which are to be used by all Christians; he gives some rules, as in the case of marriage, which do not apply at all to the clergy. So both treatises, in spite of their dedications, come to be general handbooks of morality. Ambrose's shows that even more clearly than Cicero's, for in classical Rome the political life was so normal a life for the sort of citizen Cicero had in mind that the two terms, politician and human being, are almost interchangeable. Ambrose follows Cicero's dicta very closely. Hence his work in general is directed to all men, while the specifically clerical injunctions seem to come in as digressions. One example is furnished in the treatment of *benevolentia* and *liberalitas*<sup>13</sup>. Here Ambrose gives the same rules as Cicero—e. g. we must not rob one man to aid another, we must not make gifts which will prove harmful to the recipient, etc. Rather unexpectedly he throws in a statement that the Church does not require priests and clerics to give away all their possessions and to live in common, for that would place a burden upon the Church. Even in the stress which he lays upon *benevolentia* as an essential part of *liberalitas* he had been anticipated by Cicero, and, if he goes a little farther than Cicero when he says that one should tear up the bond of a debtor who owes one money, yet he inserts Cicero's statement that charity begins at home and extends outward through the varying degrees of relationship.

The scheme of the two treatises is the same. As Cicero boasts (1.9-10, 152-161; 2.88; 3.7-10, 33-34), the outline of his work is philosophically complete. Book 1 deals with the four virtues (Platonic, if not earlier, in origin)—truth, justice, bravery, temperance—and with their conflicts, Book 2 with the principle of expediency and with conflicts to which it gives rise, Book 3 with the conflict between virtue and

expediency. Ambrose follows this outline meticulously, except in Book 1. There, after an Introduction in which he justifies his writing of the treatise, he divides *officia*, as Cicero does, into those which are *media*, and those which are *perfecta*. This procedure he defends by the story of the young man in the Gospel who kept the ten commandments, which are *media*, and was told by Jesus to "Go sell all thy goods and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come and follow Me". This distinction, formally Stoic, but based by Ambrose on the Scriptures, was destined to play a great part in Christian thought. It had been touched on before by patristic writers, but was first expressly formulated by Ambrose. In *De Viduis* 72-74 Ambrose developed it at greater length than in the *De Officiis*, and he applied there to the two classes of duties the terms *praecepta* and *consilia*. The *praeceptum* is *lex* and *non vitandum*, the *consilium* is *gratia* and *eligendum*. As finally stated by Aquinas<sup>14</sup>, the commandments are 'about those things which are necessary to attain the end of eternal felicity', the 'counsels' 'about those things by which one may obtain the end better and sooner'. Ambrose is responsible for the doctrines regulating the monastic practices of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and for the doctrine of works of supererogation.

Ambrose then discusses at great length the virtue of *verecundia*, somewhat out of its place, for in Cicero it is included in the section devoted to *temperantia*. Then Ambrose gives three rules of conduct (all the pagan Stoico-eclectic rules of Cicero). These are (1) *appetitus* must obey reason; (2) we should bestow pains on matters in proportion to their weight; (3) we should observe the fitness of times and places. These are principles of pagan ethics, and, even though Ambrose applies them in a somewhat different manner from that in which Cicero applies them, his reasoning is pagan. He proceeds to show how Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph in their conduct observed these principles, and then argues that their conduct exhibited the four cardinal virtues of *prudentia*, *iustitia*, *fortitudo*, *temperantia*. *Primus officii fons prudentia est*, says Ambrose<sup>15</sup>; this is scarcely a Christian point of view. The discussion of *fortitudo* especially is Stoic in tone; it is modelled very closely on Cicero's discussion and does not issue in any specifically Christian teachings. In his treatment of *decorum* Ambrose says what is sheer Stoicism: *decorum est secundum naturam vivere*. Cicero's formulation of this thought is *quod naturae consentaneum sit*<sup>16</sup>.

At the beginning of Book 2 Ambrose considers what is the *vita beata*. He rejects riches, for virtue alone produces blessed life, through which eternal life is reached<sup>17</sup>.

Certum est solum et summum bonum esse virtutem, eamque abundare solam ad vitae fructum beatæ, nec externis aut corporis bonis, sed virtute sola vitam præstare beatam, per quam vita æterna acquiritur. Vita enim beata fructus præsentium, vita autem æterna spes futurorum est.

<sup>13</sup>Summa Theologica, Part II, First Division, Question 108, Article 4.

<sup>14</sup>1.126.

<sup>15</sup>1.222; Cicero 1.96.

<sup>17</sup>2.18.

<sup>16</sup>Ambrose 1.143-169; Cicero 1.42-58.

He had said before<sup>18</sup>: *Scriptura autem divina vitam aeternam in cognitione posuit divinitatis, et fructu bonae operationis*. This Christian statement Ambrose finds not inconsistent with Stoic reasoning. Then, returning to Cicero, he discusses the *utile*, which he finds to lie in gaining piety, not money. However, he agrees with the Stoic reasoning again in saying that the *utile* is the *honestum*, and vice versa. Then comes the detailed discussion of conduct according to the desirable virtues.

In Book 3 it is said as before that there can be no conflict between the *honestum* and the *utile*, since nothing can be *honestum* that is not *utile*, and vice versa. The concluding exposition of right conduct, in Ambrose as in Cicero, is much less systematic than what has gone before; it is also very casuistical. Cicero's problems—the ring of Gyges, Regulus and his oath, Gaius Canius and the estate sold to him in Sicily by sharp practice, the problem of the vendor whose house has defects, and the others—are either omitted by Ambrose or are very cavalierly treated by him. In their place are put Old Testament instances, such as that of David who resolutely refused to kill Saul when opportunity to do so was given him, the conflict between what was virtuous and what was useful when Joshua and Caleb urged the Israelites to occupy the Promised Land though it was filled with powerful enemies, the stories of Judith and Holofernes, of Jephtha's daughter, and so on.

Here is found also a reference to two events of Ambrose's own time<sup>19</sup>. During a famine in a city (which must be Milan) the proposal that foreigners should be expelled in order that the citizens might have more food was defeated, and, when money was raised, food was supplied to all, citizens and foreigners. A contrast is furnished by the procedure at Rome during a time of similar stress when the strangers, even those who had passed most of their lives there, were driven out. We may see here a new note of humanity—sed et illi qui peregrinos urbe prohibent nequaquam probandi. Cicero (3.47) uses similar language, but he is discussing the advisability of allowing foreigners to live in Rome in ordinary times and decides that to debar them would be *sane inhumanum*. Ambrose, on the other hand, gives an extreme instance of the toleration of foreigners and shows that his principles will cover even this event.

Other references to contemporary events are rare, a distinct contrast to the character of Cicero's references. In one passage Ambrose speaks of the devastation of Thrace and Illyria by the Goths in 378 and the ransoming of the captives by himself, although others, the Arians, had been willing to let them remain in captivity<sup>20</sup>. A little later<sup>21</sup>, referring to the same event, he says that, in the face of hostile criticism, he carried out his plan by breaking up the precious vessels and ornaments of his Church. In the only other passage in which he refers definitely to his own life and experience, Ambrose is found in the rôle of a reader of character<sup>22</sup>. One Christian was not admitted to the ranks of the

clergy because of his unseemly gestures. Another, already a cleric, Ambrose would not allow to walk before him in procession, for his gait was seemingly arrogant. The Bishop was right in both cases, for the one deserted his faith through fear of the Arian disturbances, the other through love of money: *Lucebat in illorum incessu imago levitatis, species quaedam scurrarum praecursantium*.

Ambrose, of course, does not use Cicero's examples nor does he quote from the classical authors (except to refute them). Confirmatory quotations from Ennius and the Latin tragic and comic writers such as appear in Cicero are wholly wanting. Their place is taken by passages from the Bible, especially the Old Testament. Poetic quotations come from the Psalms or from Ambrose's favorite, Job. It is striking, if not unexpected, that Ambrose should find in Hebrew literature anticipations of the pagan philosophers. Such views had been held before him. What is unexpected is his firm belief that the Greeks borrowed all their ideas from the Jews. The argument is of course the familiar post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy. The first example I have noted is in 1.30-35. There the preaching of *decorum* is said to appear first in Psalms 64.2 Vulgate (= King James Version 65.1): *Te decet hymnus, Deus, in Sion*. Likewise Pythagoras's rule of silence was first given, Ambrose says, by David, in Psalms 38.2 Vulgate (= King James Version 39.1). The Stoic doctrine that all things were produced for the sake of man and that men must be of mutual aid to one another is borrowed from Genesis (1.26; 2.18), where Moses writes, "Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea . . .", and "It is not good that the man should be alone, I will make him an helpmeet for him". The key-passage is 2.6, where Ambrose says that, though Aristotle, Zeno, Theophrastus, and Hieronymus lived before the time of the Gospel, they came after the Prophets.

In other passages there is explicit dissent from Cicero's doctrine. Perhaps most fundamental is 1.251. Cicero<sup>23</sup> makes those duties superior which rest on social instincts (*communitas*). Ambrose makes such duties rest on *sapientia*, cum *sapientia* fundamentum sit . . . *Fundamentum autem Christus est*. Again, Ambrose will not admit that revenge is ever allowable, although Cicero will allow one man to harm another, if he has suffered wrong<sup>24</sup>. A most amusing instance of disagreement occurs in the discussion of conversational methods<sup>25</sup>. Ambrose will not admit that jesting is suitable for clerics:

Nam licet interdum honesta ioca ac suavia sint, tamen ab ecclesiastica abhorrent regula, quoniam quae in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus? . . . "Vae vobis qui ridetis, quia flebitis!" <Luke 6.25>, ait Dominus.

In the discussion of *decorum* Ambrose wonders why Cicero introduced *formositas* in his definition of *decus*. Christians commonly found nothing good in physical beauty; it seemed to them even meretricious. The trend may be seen in the early application to Christ's person of Isaiah's words <53.2>: "He hath no form

<sup>18</sup>2.5. <sup>19</sup>3.45-50. <sup>20</sup>3.70. <sup>21</sup>2.136-143. <sup>22</sup>1.71-72.

<sup>23</sup>1.153. <sup>24</sup>1.131; Cicero 1.20. <sup>25</sup>1.102-103.



nor comeliness". Spiritual beauty alone is admired; beauty of body consisted in those physical qualities which suggested moral or spiritual beauties. Ambrose himself said of the Virgin<sup>26</sup>, ut ipsa corporis species simulacrum fuerit mentis, figura probitatis <'a representation of what is approved'>.

It will be seen from this summary that Ambrose's ethical work is in no way original. It suffers from too close adherence to its model. Cicero in his *De Officiis* was not concerned with ultimate ethical questions. He left such questions for other treatises, the *De Finibus*, the *Tusculanae*, etc. He took for granted the Stoic doctrine that virtue is the *summum bonum*; Ambrose, in form at least, followed him there. Cicero used the old classification of the virtues as four; there again Ambrose followed him. It is a classification that hampered him for it is not exhaustive from the Christian viewpoint (e. g. the specifically Christian virtue of love is not included), it abounds in cross-divisions, as Plato had already found in the Republic (in Book 4 it is difficult to make a clear distinction between *σωφροσύνη* and *δικαιοσύνη*), and it totally fails to set forth the hierarchy of the virtues as Christianity must teach them. Ambrose finds himself, as has been pointed out before, making *prudentia* the highest of the virtues. Numerous ethical problems as we know them were ousted in Ambrose by the Christian doctrines of Providence, the immortality of the soul with its reward beyond the grave, and especially faith in Christ. Yet even the ideal of Christ is not kept steadily in view, but appears and disappears as Ambrose becomes less or more dependent on Cicero. The precepts given by Ambrose were such as Christianity approved; his work remained for many centuries a moral handbook, as the multiplication of manuscripts of it clearly shows. Yet there is none of that utter humility before God, man's helplessness without His grace and love, which finds consummate expression in Ambrose's pupil Augustine. Ambrose could not say, as Augustine said<sup>27</sup>, *Fecisti nos ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te*. Although Ambrose's statement and discussion of moral questions found favor with the Christian Church, yet he had not abandoned wholly the classical Roman spirit which made man an individual whose conduct depended on himself without supernatural sanctions. Christianity was, presently, to abandon that spirit, and to give itself up unreservedly to the spirit of the Old Testament and its continuers, Christ and Saint Paul. But Ambrose may be considered the last of the Roman Christians, the last of those who, nurtured on pagan ideals, could not be possessed completely of true Christianity.

YALE UNIVERSITY

M. B. EMENEAU

#### CONSTANTINE MUSURUS (1807-1891)

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.205 (May 13, 1929) Professor Charles Knapp published a note embodying a correction by Fr. Athanasius with reference to the Musurus mentioned in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.78 (December 17, 1928), in my review of William Miller,

A History of the Greek People. I had written "Marcus" instead of 'Constantine' Musurus. I was aware that the Musurus I had in mind could not be the Musurus of the Renaissance<sup>1</sup> (ca. 1470-1517), because Miller<sup>2</sup> mentions him as Turkish Minister to Athens during the reign of Otho (1832-1863), without, however, giving his Christian name<sup>3</sup>. I wish to thank both Professor Knapp and Fr. Athanasius for the correction.

The meager information I have been able to gather about Constantine Musurus is as follows<sup>4</sup>.

He was born in Mega Rheuma (Great River) of Constantinople, in 1807. His father was a Cretan, Paul Musurus. Professor Michael Constantinides, however, asserts that Musurus was a Greek<sup>5</sup>. His father's first name shows that he was a Christian. About his mother I have learned nothing.

Musurus was educated, probably, at Constantinople, in the Greek National School of the Patriarchate. There most of the Greeks of Constantinople, as well as most of the Greeks from other places, received their training. It was there, perhaps, that he learned ancient Greek. Like many other Greeks, especially the Phanariots<sup>6</sup>, he served the Turkish government, becoming a Pasha.

Mr. Miller does not say in what years Musurus was Turkish Minister in Athens, but Finley gives two dates, 1847, 1849<sup>7</sup>. But Musurus must have been in Athens much longer. Finley states that Musurus came near breaking off relations with the Greek government because he refused to James Karatassos, lieutenant-colonel in the Greek army, a visa to his passport for Constantinople, in 1847. He refused because of the conduct of Karatassos in Thessaly<sup>8</sup>; he had engaged there in guerrilla warfare against the Turkish government. Presently matters were adjusted, and Musurus returned to Athens<sup>9</sup>. But in 1849 an attempt was made to assassinate Musurus in Greece, and the Turkish demand for the extradition of the would-be assassin would have brought about a rupture in the relations between Greece and Turkey "had the three protecting powers not intervened to arrange the difficulty"<sup>10</sup>.

Constantinides states<sup>11</sup> that Musurus's "first edition <of his translation into Greek> of the Divine Comedy appeared first in three volumes, but a year ago <= 1891> a new edition appeared, revised and corrected,

<sup>1</sup>See J. E. Sandys, *A Short History of Classical Scholarship*, 188 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1915). <Professor Brouzas's paper is well worth the space it takes because of the importance of Musurus as translator of Dante into modern Greek. C. K.>

<sup>2</sup>A History of the Greek People, 41.

<sup>3</sup>Neither Miller nor Finley gives Musurus's Christian name. Finley (7.201-202, 208) gives M. (= Monsieur), which is utterly misleading. Constantinides (98) gives Musurus's name correctly.

<sup>4</sup>The information about Musurus, the year of his birth, place of birth, and father's name was furnished to me by the Greek newspaper entitled *The National Herald* (New York City). According to Fr. Athanasius, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.205, Musurus died in 1891.

<sup>5</sup>Neohellenica 98 (Macmillan, 1892).

<sup>6</sup>Finley 4.241, 252, 5.246, 280. There came "aspirants for political employment to Constantinople from every corner of the empire where Greek was spoken". See also Edson Clark, *Turkey*, 483-485 (New York, Collier and Son, 1900).

<sup>7</sup>Finley 7.201-202, 208.

<sup>8</sup>Karatassos was the son of an old Klephtic chief of Mount Olympus. Although he was an officer of the Greek army, he "joined a band of insurgents and robbers who plundered Thessaly in 1841" (Finley 7.201).

<sup>9</sup>Finley 7.202.

<sup>10</sup>Finley 7.208.

<sup>11</sup>Neohellenica 98.

<sup>26</sup>De Virginitibus 2.7.

<sup>27</sup>Augustine, Confessiones 1.1.

which contains in one volume the whole of Dante's trilogy". The second edition, therefore, must have appeared shortly before Musurus's death. Constantinides used it in printing his extracts<sup>12</sup> from the translation. Whether he knew Musurus personally he does not say, but it is likely that he met Musurus in London.

Musurus's translation is considered accurate by Constantinides<sup>13</sup>. I find its language beautiful; it is ancient Greek somewhat between the pure Attic Greek and the Greek of the New Testament. The meter is iambic trimeter acatalectic with a trochaic ending, that is, it is choliambic or seazon (compare e. g. Catullus 31), but it is accentual rather than quantitative<sup>14</sup>.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,  
MORGANTOWN, WEST VIRGINIA CHRISTOPHER G. BROUZAS

### REVIEWS

**A Latin Reader: Pliny, Martial, Sallust, Ovid and Catullus.** By Walter Ripman and M. Vivian Hughes. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton (1925). Pp. viii + 226. 90 cents.

**A Latin Reader**, by Messrs. Ripman and Hughes, is designed for pupils in the second or the third year of the study of Latin. It is divided into three parts; each part is intended, evidently, to correspond to one of the three terms of the English Schools.

Part I (1-78) contains nine Sections, which fall into three groups. In each group two Sections devoted to Pliny the Younger are followed by a Section allotted to Martial. There are in all twenty-seven letters from Pliny, including the two dealing with the eruption of Vesuvius (6.16, 20), the letter to Trajan concerning the treatment of the Christians, with the Emperor's reply (10.96, 97), the letter concerning the funeral of Virginius Rufus (2.1), the ghost story (7.27), the letter on the Vadimonian Lakes (8.20), and the letter about the school at Comum (4.13).

Martial is represented by twenty-three epigrams, about 200 verses in all, including 10.47 (on the happy life), and 1.42 (on Portia).

Part II (79-167) is given entirely to Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum*, Chapter 5 to the end. A few sections here and there are omitted, but summaries are given to make the narrative intelligible.

Part III (168-226) is made up of Ovid (168-207), including selections from the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Fasti*, *Tristia*, and *Metamorphoses*, about 580 verses in all, and Catullus (207-226), eighteen poems in all: 1-4, 31, 49, 22, 10, 13, 84, 27, 75, 85, 92, 76, 65, 101.

At the end of each of the twenty-seven Sections there are exercises and questions under the heading "Tests". Each Test<sup>1</sup> is divided into four parts. The

first is taken up with questions on the subject-matter of the selections, the second with English derivatives from Latin words, or with the Latin words from which certain English words are derived, the third with grammatical exercises and drill, and the fourth with two sets of exercises, containing disconnected and connected English sentences to be put into Latin. In the later Tests there are occasional bits of English poetry to be put into Latin. Test 27 (page 226) has two passages in verse.

It will be seen from note 1, below, that the editors try to make Latin living and practical as well as interesting. The notes, placed at the foot of the page, are for the most part translations of difficult words or clauses, but they contain some explanations. To many of the selections there are short Introductions. There is also an Introduction to each author. An excellent feature of the book is the marking of the quantities. This is done through the eighteenth Section, i. e. through the selections from Sallust. In Sections 19-27 only the doubtful and less obvious quantities (also 'hidden' quantities) are marked.

On the inside of the front cover there is a map of the Roman Empire. An attempt is made here to show the characteristic animals, plants, etc. Within the back cover there are a list of important events and their dates, and a list of the principal Roman writers, with dates of birth and death. There are a short Preface and a Table of Contents, but no index. The printing is carefully done.

The book is interesting and contains good material from certain Roman authors. It brings together some of the best known pieces of these authors in a convenient form for those who have not sufficient time to take up each author separately in more detailed edi-

(under the Antonines) would be useful to refer to, and can be had in cheap editions.

A. (1) Write the reply of Septicius Clarus to Pliny, describing the dinner he actually had, and wishing that he had been at Pliny's more intellectual one.

(2) Imagine yourself a Roman boy and describe the day when you assumed your toga virilis.

(3) Describe a day's hunting in England (e. g., fox, otter), getting words to help you from I.

(4) Find any superstitions about weddings, and compare our ceremonies with the Roman.

(5) Find any points of contrast between our will-making and the Roman.

(6) Ascertain when Tacitus lived and what he wrote about.

(7) What have you gathered from these letters as to a country gentleman's favourite occupations under the Empire?

(8) Find pictures of Diana and Minerva.

B. (1) What English words are connected with: stilus, manus, silva, promitto, computo, poena, studeo, urbs, vir, ars, transfero, auctoritas, capio, perdo, iungo, nuptiae, scribo, relinquo, ago?

(2) What Latin words are connected with: ridiculous, quiet, reporter, contempt, vision, valedictory, comedian, experiment, levity, sufficient, favour, transient, counsel, event, penitence, secret?

C. (1) Licet rideas: for "rideas" substitute the present subjunctive of *sedeo* (1st Sg.), *aliquid meditor* (2d Pl.), *ludo* (3d Pl.), *ei excuso* (2d Sg.).

<(2) and (3) are of the same tenor>.

(4) What part of the verb is: *reportarem*, *venabere*, *perit*, *existi*, *rissemus*, *potes*, *experire*, *secesseris*, *transibit*, *feceris*, *absumpsi*? Give the principal parts of each verb.

(5) Write out all instances of the subjunctive in these four letters, and try to arrange them in groups (e. g., under the headings "condition," "purpose," etc.).

(6) What is the nominative singular and the gender of *quiete*, *manus*, *corpori*, *cogitationis*, *genere*, *curribus*, *nomina*, *litteris*, *spe*?

(7) Find instances of adverbs in the comparative and superlative.

D. Translate into Latin:  
<Here follow 13 detached sentences and a connected passage, of 9 lines, to be put into Latin>.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibidem*, 102-112. <sup>13</sup>*Ibidem*, 111.

<sup>14</sup>According to Constantinides (112), "Musurus says in the preface to the translation that he employed the twelve-syllable meter ending in a paroxytone word similar in fact to the iambic, but without its rhythm or quantity".

<sup>15</sup>As a specimen of these Tests I give the first (page 8), based on Pliny 1.6, 1.13, 9.6, 1.9. I omit, however, the macrons.

<sup>16</sup>I. Tests

Procure if possible for your Latin work an Ancient Atlas, a Roman History, and postcards of Roman antiquities (such as are issued by the authorities of the British Museum). Plutarch's Lives and Gibbon



tions. The tests are excellent, stimulative, and helpful in reviewing.

But I doubt whether pupils of the third year in our High Schools will find the book suitable<sup>2</sup>. For the first year of College, however, it fits very well.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,  
MORGANTOWN, WEST VIRGINIA CHRISTOPHER G. BROUZAS

A Study of the Moretum. By Florence Louise Douglas. Syracuse, New York: Privately Printed (1929). Pp. 169.

In a book entitled A Study of the Moretum, written as a Master's thesis at Syracuse University, the author Miss Florence Louise Douglas, seeks, as the Preface indicates (9), "to evaluate the poem, and to discover within it whatever may clarify the disputed issue <of authorship>". The book contains a text of the Moretum (11-14), mainly that of Robinson Ellis, a prose translation (15-19), a commentary (20-60), and a translation into English hexameters (61-68). There follows a discussion of the question of authorship (69-159) which takes up more than half the volume and is concerned with evidences of Vergilian authorship in the use of the poem by Columella, and evidence of Vergilian characteristics in the types of humor found in the poem, the metrical style, and the dramatic character. The author adds, as an Appendix, a text of the Copa (in the main, Ellis's) and a translation into English elegiacs (162-166). A Bibliography concludes the book (167-169).

The intrinsic merit of the Moretum and the fact that it has been little treated add to the interest of any new discussion of this poem. To me the outstanding feature of Miss Douglas's work is the chapter (74-99) in which examples are given to indicate that Columella, in Book 10, De Cultu Hortorum, written in hexameters, makes use not only of Vergil's Eclogues and Georgics but also of the Moretum. Were this susceptible of absolute proof, there would be fair evidence for the Vergilian authorship of the Moretum, for Columella in this book, as he himself indicates (434), follows Vergil very closely. Of the twenty or twenty-five resemblances noted by Miss Douglas some are too faint to be due to imitation. In other cases resemblances of theme, i.e. the fact that the names and the characteristics of the same flowers and plants are being given, may account for the similarities of language. Comparison of passages like Columella 10.109-113 and Moretum 84-90 does, however, tempt one to adopt the theory of imitation. But, even if imitation be admitted, that plague of critics—the question of priority—is still undecided<sup>3</sup>. This latter point Miss Douglas passes

<sup>2</sup>Where students start the study of Latin in College, it is possible to use the book in the first or the second part of the third year. For instance, we offer five-hour courses in elementary Latin, finishing two years of Latin in one. The beginning of the second year is taken up with the study of Cicero's Orations and Letters, the second term with Vergil. It is needless to say that we do not cover all the material that a regular four-year course in a good High School would cover. We stress only the essentials and are thus able to cover a great deal of ground.

<sup>3</sup>Unless, of course, we accept Scaliger's argument that the Moretum was written at a time when lettuce was eaten toward the end of the meal (see Moretum 76), that is, not after Vergil's time (see Martial 13.14).

over in silence. She has, however, in these few pages made a real contribution by bringing to our attention the resemblances between the two poems.

Of the rest of the book the notes afford most interest, for the Moretum in its short compass contains several verses of extraordinary difficulty. In verse 13 the attempt to justify *lux*<sup>2</sup>, the reading of the best manuscripts, is, I fear, ill-considered. The resultant word-order is hardly possible. In verse 15 the reading *et reserat clausae quae pervidet ostia clavis* is adopted and is translated thus: "and he unbars the closed bolt which thoroughly looks out for the door". On page 62 Miss Douglas renders the verse by "Draws the bolt of the close-drawn bar that watches the doorway". She may be consoled by the fact that no one else has been able to do much with the verse.

An interesting feature of the Commentary is the discussion of passages where possibly there lurk hidden meanings, puns, etc., and where the uncertainty or ambiguity of the connection of participles veils the text in an obscurity similar to that found at times in Vergil's major works.

For the rest of the book not so much can be said. The English hexameter is not the happiest medium by which to transfer the charming spirit of this delightful idyll. So far as the question of authorship is concerned, little positive reason for belief in Vergilian authorship is to be found in the types of humor employed in the Moretum, or in such general aspects of the meter as the author mentions<sup>3</sup>, or in the dramatic element. To be sure, such evidence tends to the conclusion that it is not impossible that Vergil was the author. But to prove Vergilian authorship is quite another matter<sup>4</sup>.

The translation of the Copa into English elegiacs with leonine rhyme in the pentameter is an interesting exercise; but a translation which employs a measure so strange to English is almost certain to be labored at times. This is the case with the present version.

The fine external appearance of the book is unfortunately marred by an inexcusably large number of misprints and by inconsistencies and questionable judgment in matters of form.

TOWNSEND HARRIS HALL,  
NEW YORK CITY

ISRAEL E. DRABKIN

<sup>2</sup>The author translates thus: "but the glow <of the *ignis* (12)> dies down after he catches the flash <with the *lucerna* (10)>".

<sup>3</sup>The discussion here is concerned mainly with assonance. The Moretum is hardly long enough to yield satisfactory conclusions from the application of the usual metrical criteria. No reference is made to the argument for a post-Augustan date based on *abicio*, 96 (Miss Douglas reads *adicio*), scanned with first syllable short. Lucian Müller makes this an important reason for rejecting a theory of Vergilian authorship, on the ground that the poets of the Golden Age lengthened the first syllable of such compounds (see, for example, Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, s. v. *abicio*, 1.81.63-66, and s. v. *adicio*, 1.666.19-34, and Lucian Müller, Catulli Tibulli Propertii Carmina, Praefatio xliii). Mr. O. J. Todd, in an article entitled The Authorship of the Moretum, Classical Philology 20 (1925), 336-340, independently adduces the same argument. I am inclined, however, to minimize the importance of the point. The examples for *abicio* are too few to enable us to fix a rule. We may note, too, *adicitur*, with first syllable long, in verse 90.

<sup>4</sup>It is interesting to note the disagreement of scholars when subjective appraisal of the Moretum is involved. Thus Professor E. K. Rand, in Young Virgil's Poetry, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 30 (1919), 178, says, "The art of this delightful and original production is not Virgilian", but Professor J. W. Mackail, in Virgil and Virgilianism, The Classical Review 22 (1908), 72, declares that "The internal evidence for the Virgilian authorship of the Moretum is so good that it would require but little external support..."

**Pots and Pans: The History of Ceramics.** By H. S. Harrison. New York: William Morrow and Company (1928). Pp. x + 83. \$1.00.

The volume called *Pots and Pans* belongs to the series entitled *The Beginnings of Things*, published under the editorial supervision of the distinguished anthropologist G. Elliot Smith. For reviews of other volumes of the Series see *The Classical Journal* 25:52-57, 387-389.

Mr. Harrison's book is one of the most satisfactory volumes which has so far appeared in the Series. It is written by a man whose knowledge of the technicalities of the potter's craft is intimate. Much of our information concerning the origins of pottery must necessarily be vague; but Mr. Harrison threads his way cautiously through a maze of inference and, by avoiding hasty generalization, makes his presentation of the beginnings of this most universal of the crafts of man seem very plausible.

The successive chapters deal with the forms of pots and the clay used in making them (1-7, 8-17), with the invention of the craft (18-21), with the potter's skill and his mechanical instruments (22-30, 31-37), and with substance and decoration (38-70). The volume concludes with an interesting chapter (*Digressions and Deductions*, 71-83) in which Mr. Harrison brings his subject-matter definitely to bear upon the question which lies at the basis of this series of books, namely, the problem of the diffusion of culture. Mr. Harrison is a diffusionist, but a thoroughly sane one, and his method, that of intimate study of the facts, is the only possible method. He argues that the potter's craft is in essence experimental, that the potter's discoveries are the result either of accident or of imitation of ideas suggested from the outside, and that the continuous development of the art, therefore, is proof of persistent, even if sporadic, human intercourse.

There is little likelihood, he says (16), that the discovery of pottery <was> made at different times and in several places, in complete independence. It is a question of a chain of events rather than a single coincidence.

The idea, thus presented, is one of the most convincing yet adduced by the diffusionists.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CASPER J. KRAMER, JR.

#### VERGIL IN COLONIAL SOUTH CAROLINA

Varro wrote his *De Re Rustica* for the special benefit of his wife Fundania, to assist her in the management of her own land. The Countess Evelyn Martinengo Cesaresco, in her book, *Outdoor Life in the Greek and Roman Poets* (Macmillan, 1911: see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12:113-114) testifies (98) that in our own time "a great many <Italian married women>, like Fundania, themselves manage the land which came to them as their dowry . . . and such land is generally in good order". Many women in our own country in all times have managed their own land, but not many have experimented so much and so successfully as Eliza Lucas Pinckney (1773-1793), who succeeded in establishing the cultivation of indigo in colonial South Carolina. In her girlhood at home she was in charge of her father's plantations while he was absent as Governor of Antigua. It was at this period that she wrote to a friend about reading Vergil a letter quoted on page 50 of her life as written by one of her descendants (Eliza Pinckney, by Harriott Horry Ravenel, 196):

"I have got no further than the first vol. of Virgil, but was most agreeably disappointed to find myself instructed in agriculture as well as entertained by his charming pen, for I am persuaded 'tho he wrote for Italy it will in many instances suit Carolina. I had never perused those books before, and imagined I should immediately enter upon battles, storms and tempests, that would put mee in a maze, and make mee shudder while I read. But the calm and pleasing diction of pastoral and gardening agreeably presented themselves not unsuitably to this charming season of the year. . ."

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON